

Journal of Scandinavian Cinema
Volume 2 Number 3

© 2012 Intellect Ltd Article. English language. doi: 10.1386/jzca.2.3.201_1

short subject

BJØRN SØRENSSEN
NTNU

HANNU SALMI
University of Turku

EDVIN VESTERGAARD KAU
University of Aarhus

JAN OLSSON
Stockholm University

World War II and Scandinavian cinema: An overview

ABSTRACT

This article gives a short introduction to the distinctly different wartime experiences of the film industries in the Nordic countries during World War II.

World War II had a profound impact on Scandinavian history and society,

though the five countries had distinctly different experiences of the conflict.

Both Denmark and Norway were occupied by Nazi Germany, but the occupation took different forms. In addition to the enormous number of German soldiers Norway had to sustain as part of the Atlantic Wall defence – more than 300,000 soldiers,

KEYWORDS

Scandinavian cinema
Nordic cinema
film history
World War II

1. Film-making in Iceland was still very limited at this time, and will not be considered here.

equal to a tenth of the Norwegian population – the legitimate government of Norway was driven in exile from the first day and the puppet regime of Vidkun Quisling's Nasjonal Samling (NS) installed. Although the first three years of the German occupation of Denmark appeared undramatic, with a civil national administration in place, the end of civilian Danish rule in 1943 gave rise to a larger role for the resistance movement.

Of the Scandinavian countries, Finland suffered the greatest losses in terms of human and material resources. After the 1939 Winter War against the Soviet Union Finland was in the unusual situation of first being allied with Germany in the so-called Continuation War, before switching sides in 1944 and fighting the Germans in the Lapland campaign of 1944–1945. Sweden, on the other hand, managed to stay out of armed conflict, performing a diplomatic tightrope walk, often dictated by the fortunes of war, initially giving in to German demands of troop transportation through Swedish territory, while adopting a more Allied-friendly attitude after 1943–1944. This kaleidoscope of national wartime experiences also includes the occupation of Iceland by the British in 1940, an occupation taken over by the Americans in 1941.

Given these diverse backgrounds, a study of cinema in the Nordic countries during the war years opens up for interesting comparisons that reveal great variation in the production, distribution and exhibition of motion pictures. This diversity also applies to the film industries of these countries. In terms of exhibition, the occupied countries of Denmark and Norway were soon cut off from distributing British and American movies. The German film industry was, of course, more than willing to step into this void and launched

ambitious distribution plans in both Denmark and Norway. Swedish films, however, proved to be a very attractive alternative to the fare provided by the Third Reich.

In terms of production there were major differences among the Scandinavian countries, since two countries, Sweden and Denmark, had a historically well-established film industry and two others, Norway and Finland, were considerably less advanced in this respect.¹

SWEDEN: SHIFTING ALLEGIANCES AND A NEW FOCUS ON SWEDISHNESS

While Swedish film critics generally had been critical of the domestic film production of the early sound film years, comparing these films unfavourably with the silent films of the 'Golden Age' of Victor Sjöström and Mauritz Stiller, as the war closed in, they detected a sea change, largely propelled by a single film, *Ett brott/A Crime* (Henrikson, 1940), from Sigfrid Siwertz' drama of the same title.

A Crime marks a shift of tone and emphasis that came to characterize film production at large as established genres were reconfigured. Hapless men in uniform were relegated to the stock shelf. Instead close-knit groups of military men emerged, composed as a cross-section of society and commanding respect, even admiration. The air-force film *Första divisionen/The First Division* (Ekman, 1940) is the key example of the so-called *beredskapsfilm* (literally 'preparedness cinema') from a period when the war was a reality immediately outside Sweden's borders. At this juncture the government, composed of members from all parties except the communists, elected to heed a German request for troop transport on Swedish railways from occupied Norway to the new theatre of combat in the Soviet

Union. The so-called Midsummer Crisis tested and taxed Swedish resolve and the interpretation of neutrality to its limit. Afterwards, German troops could transit through Sweden, to the dismay not least of the leading Swedish critic of Hitler's Germany, editor-in-chief Torgny Segerstedt of the Gothenburg daily *Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning*.

Traditionally, Sweden had close bonds with Germany. Thus, unsurprisingly, the Swedish film industry cooperated when Goebbels' launched his newfangled body, the International Film Chamber (IFC). Goebbels and his cohorts had geared up for a fight against American films and others perceived as anti-German well in advance of embarking on actual warfare. Although Sweden joined the Film Chamber, two-thirds of the films screened in Sweden's 2000 cinemas came from Hollywood. To keep the theatres running and profitable, Sweden had to overcome transportation snags affecting American films throughout the war. As imports from England, France, and later Germany dwindled, domestic production spiked. This was not only to substitute for imported productions and fill screen slots – a local framing in Sweden had ideological value for boosting morale by depicting life in the shadow of the war as well as offering hope for a better future. The authorities were particularly keen on this aspect of cinema, and the new National Board of Information, Statens Informationsstyrelse, provided incentives encouraging producers to focus on short films with a distinct Swedishness around which people could rally irrespective of political persuasion. This body worked closely with the Bureau of Film Censors, which in turn consulted with the State Department. The Bureau was particularly vigilant concerning voice-overs for documentaries. It was important not to encourage defeatism when depicting battlefield scenes. In addi-

tion, the Bureau was very sensitive to criticism of foreign powers and thus for example banned Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* (1940).

As feature production reached new heights in sheer numbers, some directors more or less barred during the 1930s re-emerged, most prominently renowned theatre director Alf Sjöberg. He had directed a single film back in 1929 and nothing since. Hired by minor producers, Sjöberg returned to cinema in a lateral move. His comeback title, *Med livet som insats/They Staked Their Lives* (1940), deserves recognition, perhaps even more than *A Crime*, for signalling a novel engagement with wartime sentiments. From 1940 until the early 1960s, Sjöberg was one of Sweden's leading film directors, famous not only for *Hets/Frenzy* (1944) from a script by Ingmar Bergman, but primarily, perhaps, for his stylistically innovative *Fröken Julie/Miss Julie* (1951), which won him laurels in Cannes.

After Stalingrad, Swedish policies and allegiances gradually shifted. The most discernible reframing was marked by the dominant production company Svensk Filmindustri's (SF) 1942 adaptation of Vilhelm Moberg's novel *Rid i natt/Ride Tonight!* (Molander 1942). The historical setting reveals clear parallels to contemporary Europe and the tenet is unmistakably anti-German. Almost simultaneously, SF recruited a new CEO, Anders Dymling, a Shakespeare scholar and Anglophile with a track record from radio. It was under his tenure that SF's *Ride Tonight!* premiered, and the following year came the box office hit *Det brinner en eld/There Burns a Fire* (Molander, 1943) – the first in a cycle of films about military occupations with men in uniforms everyone read as German. The most ideologically explicit film in this cycle was *Excellensen/His Excellency* (Ekman, 1944), based on a drama by Bertil Malmberg. In both these films Lars Hanson plays memorable roles. When *His Excellency* opened in 1944, it was obvious that Germany

would fall, and gradually producers prepared for a post-war era. SF celebrated its first 25 years in 1944. Among a group of jubilee films was Carl Th. Dreyer's *Toå menneskor/Two People* (1945). Signing up a Danish refugee might seem the right thing to do for a film company in step with the Allies' agenda. In addition to this, with Stiller dead and Sjöström retired from directing, Dreyer, as the director of *Prästänkan/The Parson's Widow* (1920), was a sole link to the studio's best years and canonic roster of films. The collaboration did not work out, however; the film became one of the studio's worst flops and was shelved after only a five-day run in spring 1945. A year later, a film documentary from the funeral ceremonies for Sweden's deceased Prime Minister, Per Albin Hansson, marks the end of an era of consensus and cooperation across the political spectrum. As the relative prosperity of the post-war years was ushered in the Social Democrats were at the helm for decades to come.

DENMARK: GERMAN PRESSURE AND DOMESTIC SUCCESS AT THE BOX OFFICE

As expected, the German occupation of Denmark (1940–1945) brought considerable problems for the Danish film industry. Movie theatre owners had actually anticipated the problem of film availability in case of a war situation as early as autumn 1939. Exhibitors and producers could not rely on access to foreign film and film stock, worries that were further aggravated when German troops crossed the Danish border on 9 April 1940. The war years nevertheless turned out to be a good period for the Danish film industry.

Initially, there were several possibilities for Danish exhibitors and distributors. In addition to around 500 film titles in circulation, there were a number of films on the shelf, yet to be released. This meant that theatres and

distributors were able to cope, at least for some time. They had no way of knowing, however, what the coming years would bring, whether film imports would taper off or disappear completely because of the war, diminished production or outright bans.

Another possibility for exhibitors was to rely on reruns – a significant subset of the approximately 70 sound films produced during the previous decade had been considerable successes with enduring profitability. In addition, the expected shortage of imported film could be seen as a boon to domestic film production, making Danish film more competitive.

The German occupation forces wanted to enforce a ban, primarily on British and American film, partly on ideological grounds, but also to remove strong competitors to German film. German movies were regarded as an important part of a cultural-political struggle and the Germans wanted to secure the strongest possible position for German cinema. Members of the Danish film trade and the Department of Justice succeeded in slowing down the effects of a possible ban, resulting in a gradual phase-out of American film following the initial ban in the winter of 1941–1942. The final date for showing American movies was set at the end of 1942, whereas British productions had been banned after 1940 and a ban on Soviet film was enforced after the German attack on the Soviet Union in July 1941. In March 1944 a ban on French films produced before 1941 followed, as the Germans suspected that French productions were used as a substitute for popular American movies and thus were blocking the potential success of German film in Denmark.

In all negotiations the ultimate German argument was, of course, the use of force and the monopoly on film stock (Agfa). Film stock supplies were actually blocked in autumn 1943 for a short period. The Danish

Department of Justice had to warn representatives of the film industry about the danger of 'German intervention against the business', as it was stated. This was underscored by sabotage bomb attacks against three studios (Nordisk Film, Palladium and ASA) and a theatre (Kinopalæet) by a German-led terrorist group of Danish collaborators, the so-called 'Peter Group'.

The situation in Denmark from late summer 1943 until the end of the war was characterized by recurring and escalating violent confrontations between the Danish resistance movement and the occupiers. The Germans responded to Danish sabotage with a state of siege and terror. During 1943 there was a dramatic rise in the number of German liquidations and counter-sabotage attacks and on 29 August 1943, the Danish government stepped down, putting a definitive end to the illusion of a 'peaceful occupation', a situation both German and Danish negotiators had tried to uphold. The Danes tried to avoid direct German control and the use of force for as long as possible and the Germans were interested in presenting Denmark as a 'model protectorate'.

Against this background the insistence from the occupation forces on a film policy favouring German films in Danish distribution and exhibition must be understood both as a cultural and a propaganda policy, as well as serving the economic interests of the German movie industry. When Danish theatre owners often favoured domestic re-releases over more recent German movies, it might be interpreted as obstruction, but was often motivated by the poor quality of German films. As in Norway, Veit Harlan's *Die goldene Stadt/The Golden City* (1942) was a considerable box office hit in Denmark in 1943. This was mainly because of its sensationalist impact

as the first large-scale European colour production, but it also reflects the enforcements of the policy pushed by the occupation authorities. The Reichsfilmkammer (German Film Chamber), Ufa and the German legation in Denmark now demanded that every second film screened in Copenhagen's first-run theatres should be German. In addition, second-run theatres had to run at least six German films every three months and the Ufa Newsreel was to be shown in all cinemas.

The increasing number of bans and regulation from the Germans eventually functioned as a competitive advantage for Danish domestic film production, since the theatres were forced to offer virtually nothing except Danish, Swedish, German and new French movies, primarily those produced by German-owned Continental. For reasons connected with culture, language and ideology as well as quality, the audience preferred Danish movies and generally avoided German productions. The fact that Danish movies, old and new, did far better at the box office than ever before opened up opportunities for domestic film producers not only to increase the number of productions, but also to attempt to imbue the films with more psychological and artistic depth than was the case with the more superficial popular farces of the 1930s.

Throughout the entire occupation the number of tickets sold at box offices steadily increased, despite German regulation of public life and curfews. The increase from 1940 to 1945 was 60 per cent, partly because Danish film now was viewed as a matter of national pride and unity. Not only did 30 new theatres open, the average percentage of seat utilization rose from 42 per cent to 68 per cent. This meant that production companies were able to produce to full capacity. Reduced competition from foreign film made

it possible for Danish cinema to venture into genres and themes hitherto dominated by larger foreign countries, especially the United Kingdom and the United States. In addition to the light comedies and farces of the pre-war period, more elegant comedies, romantic comedies, crime movies approaching a noir atmosphere and social problem films now premiered. In this setting we find Carl Th. Dreyer's masterpiece *Vredens dag/Day of Wrath* (1943).

At the same time production companies saved on falling production costs, partly caused by a general lack of production material, partly by the fact that the scarcity of film stock led to more economical production forms, helping to keep production time down. The average cost of single productions diminished from 200,000 DKK in the pre-war years to an average of 150,000–180,000 DKK. Success at the box office led to a doubling of the number of domestically produced films in this period.

NORWAY: A NATIONAL FILM POLICY WITH DUBIOUS RESULTS

Seen from a Norwegian point of view, it is ironic that the occupation years provided a model for a successful state-supported system of national film production in which a substantial portion of the box office money was reinvested in film production.

In cooperation with the German occupation authorities a new state agency was set up to deal with film production and distribution. *Filmdirektoratet/The Film Directorate* was formally established on 1 January 1941 with Leif Sinding, an experienced and respected film director, as its head. Sinding immediately set about reorganizing the Norwegian film industry. In April he issued a decree for the exhibition of cinematographic images that abolished

Norwegian control – that is, the censorship panel that had been in effect since 1913. From now on the Directorate would decide which films to show. This ignored the fact that the German Film Commissariat had already decided that German films should be given preference and that no films of 'enemy' origin were to be shown.

Another point in the decree was more radical and was intended to be the first step in Sinding's ambitious plan to create a Norwegian national film industry partly financed by income from film distribution and exhibition. From now on film distributors and would-be producers needed the Directorate's approval to distribute films for exhibition. In May and December other decrees stated that only the Directorate would be allowed to import film and the films would then be made available to seven – later reduced to five – authorized film distributors. More important still: only these authorized companies would be allowed to produce films. To secure funding, 50 per cent of profits from rentals should be set aside for production (Sørenssen 2007: 222–24).

To his superiors in the department, the zealous Sinding hinted that this authorization ought to be reserved for people who were representative of the 'new times', i.e. members of Quisling's NS, and he also suggested that all owners of municipal cinemas should be party members. This suggestion was turned down by the Interior Department because they knew it would be impossible to find enough local party members willing to take on such a job. Sinding also continued his fight against the municipal cinema system. Having lost the struggle to privatize Norwegian municipal film exhibition, he now turned with greater success to the municipally owned distribution and production companies.

The organization of Norwegian municipal cinemas owned two import and distribution companies, Kommunenes Filmcentral (KF) and Fotorama. Fotorama was denied authorization and thus abolished. Sinding would have liked the same to happen to KF, but he encountered resistance from the Interior Department, which was not willing to see this source of municipal income disappear. All he could do was to bar KF from taking part in film production. Sinding's main target, however, was the municipally owned Norsk Film A/S with its brand new studio and production facilities at Jar, outside of Oslo. In August 1941 Sinding managed to push through a decision to transfer Norsk Film from the Interior Department to the Film Directorate. At the same time it was decided that henceforth the company was to be regarded solely as a service organization, providing production facilities to the productions of the Directorate and the authorized production companies (Hanche 2001: 55–61).

Production of documentaries and propaganda films was organized directly under the Directorate and was located at the Norsk Film studios at Jar. This propaganda production unit was furnished with an ample budget from money raised by increasing the luxury tax on film exhibition, and beginning in the summer of 1941 the unit produced the first regular Norwegian national newsreel. The municipal cinema company of Oslo had screened a regular local newsreel in the immediate pre-war years, but a newsreel with national distribution was something new. The Germans obviously supported the idea and provided a full documentary production unit for the newsreel, to be shown in connection with the German Ufa Newsreel. In many ways the Norwegian newsreel may be considered the most

successful propaganda effort of the Quisling government: general news and human interest items were interspersed with items presenting the various activities of the NS movement, thus lending a feeling of everyday acceptance to these activities (Helseth 2004).

The anticipated feature films of 'high political and cultural quality' promised by the Film Directorate nevertheless failed to materialize. In 1940 and 1941, eight feature films were produced, none of any political or cultural significance, though one of them went on to become one of the most popular and successful Norwegian films ever, the nonsensical Laurel-and-Hardy style comedy *Den forsvunne pølsemaker/The Lost Sausage-Maker* (Sandø, 1941) featuring the escapist humour of Leif Juster and Ernst Diesen, two of the Oslo stage's most popular comedians. Popular comedies continued to dominate in 1942; among the year's five films were the sequel to the 'Sausage-maker' and a sophisticated comedy by veteran director Tancred Ibsen, who shortly thereafter was arrested and deported to Germany along with other Norwegian commissioned officers. In spite of the new incentives being offered, the film community seemed to be dragging its feet, content to produce mediocre escapist entertainment.

The politically oriented films that Sinding had promised began appearing in 1943. One of them, *Sangen til livet/The Song of Life* (1943) was directed by Sinding himself, a lackluster affair that did not live up to Sinding self-proclaimed standards. Sinding had also spent considerable time and energy opposing the other, far more interesting political film to appear in 1943, Walter Fyrst's *Unge viljer/Young Wills*. Fyrst had been one of the founders of NS in 1933 but had fallen out with Quisling before the war. In 1940 he re-joined the

party and two years later proposed making a feature film presenting the ideas of the Norwegian National Socialist movement. Sinding, whose allegiance to the film trade apparently was stronger than his ideological underpinnings, opposed the idea from the start, sensing that an overt manifestation of a movement deeply hated by a majority of Norwegians would cause trouble and perhaps destroy box office possibilities for Norwegian films in the future (Sørenssen 2007: 226–29).

As in Denmark, the war years meant good box office income for domestic Norwegian film production and a marked popularity for Swedish and Danish films. Sigurd Evensmo, film enthusiast and resistance fighter who miraculously escaped execution by the Nazis, summed up official Norwegian film policy during the war as a great paradox. In his 1967 history of Norwegian film, he describes the legacy of NS film policy as positive in that it stimulated quality domestic production, as compared to the total indifference of the pre-war democratic and social-democratic system to the plight of Norwegian film (Evensmo 1967: 254).

FINLAND: UNEASY ALLIANCES

Finland was drawn into World War II soon after its outbreak. Between 1939 and 1945, Finland in fact fought no fewer than three wars: the Winter War (1939–1940) against the Soviet Union, the Continuation War (1941–1944) with Germany against the Soviet Union and, finally the Lapland War (1944–1945) against Germany. There was also a period of peace, often called the Interim Peace (1940–1941). To many Finns, World War II was a traumatic, ambiguous series of events, where orientations and ideological inclinations had to change and old friends became enemies. The

war also had a strong impact on film production and distribution.

In the summer of 1939 Finland was preparing to organize the Summer Olympics slated for the following year. Following the example of the Berlin Olympics, Finnish film companies aimed at making the event visible on the silver screen and had acquired new cameras and other cinematographic equipment. When the Winter War broke out on 30 November 1939, it became obvious that no sports event could take place and instead the new cameras were turned to capture a different kind of event, later described as 'the frozen hell'.

Short documentaries were made during the Winter War, but otherwise film production was halted. After the end of the war in March 1940, many of those fiction films that had been shot the previous summer were finally released. Especially the musical comedy *SF-Paraati/SF-Parade* (Norta, 1940) became popular and was interpreted as an almost nostalgic echo of the last pre-war summer. In spring 1940, film production recovered rapidly – almost signalling a return to normal life. The major companies, Suomen Filmitoimisto (SF) and Suomi-Filmi, held their position despite numerous material and economical problems. In principle, Suomi-Filmi had better possibilities since it had a nationwide theatre chain. Still, SF's production figures remained higher, resulting in 49 feature films between 1940 and 1945, which is almost half the total number of films (109). During the same period, Suomi-Filmi produced 32 features. Other production companies remained tiny. The only one to achieve regular production figures was Fenno-Filmi, completing nine films, mainly around the end of the Continuation War (Uusitalo 1977: 202). Fenno-Filmi clearly had a profile of its own and released thrillers such

as *Varjoja Kannaksella/ Shadows over the Isthmus* (Luts and Uotila, 1943) and *Hiipivää vaaraa/ Creeping Danger* (Norta, 1944).

During the war years, SF and Suomi-Filmi offered a wide array of genres and styles. They released biopics like *Runon kuningas ja muuttolintu/ The King of Poets and the Bird of Passage* (Särkkä, 1940) and *Balladi/ Ballad* (Särkkä, 1944), adventure films like *Herra ja ylhäisyys/ Lord and Master* (Nortimo, 1944) and melodramas like *Valkoiset ruusut/ White Roses* (Leminen, 1943). Audiences responded especially well to historical romances, for example *Kulkurin valssi/ The Vagabond's Waltz* (Särkkä, 1941) and *Katariina ja Munkkiniemen kreivi/ Catherine and the Count of Munkkiniemi* (Eltelä, 1943). During the Continuation War, some – but relatively few – films directly addressed the war efforts. Risto Orko's military farces *Ryhmy ja Romppainen/ Ryhmy and Romppainen* (1941) and *Jees ja just/ Yes and Right Away!* (1943) portrayed spirited Finnish soldiers who were overwhelmingly brave compared to the enemy and mastered all difficult situations at the front.

Finnish family ideology gained particular impetus through cinema during the war. *The Family Suominen* had started its adventures as a radio series in the 1930s, based on the Swedish *Familjen Björk* radio plays. In 1941, Väinö and Aino Suominen and their children appeared for the first time on-screen in *Suomisen perhe/ The Family Suominen*, directed by Toivo Särkkä. The film spoke of modest family values and, in contrast to the rural tradition of Finnish cinema, this series took a middle-class Helsinki family as the epitome of Finnishness (Soila 1998: 56).

The Winter War caused a break in film production, but otherwise film-making flourished – during the war years there were almost as

many premieres every year as in 1938 and 1939. It is obvious that cinema was highly valued as a form of entertainment, propaganda and communication. Usually films did not deal with politically controversial issues. The director-producer of Suomi-Filmi, Risto Orko, admitted later that after the Winter War 'headquarters asked for comedy' (Salmi 1993: 191).

In 1941, the Finnish film industry drifted into serious conflicts. Suomen Filmikamari (the Finnish Film Chamber, FFC) had become a member of the IFC, based in Berlin, even before the war. IFC remained inactive during the first war years, but in 1941 it was reorganized to strongly support German interests. Its central aim was to remove British and American films from the market. In Finland this agenda caused controversy and in 1942 led to the complete division of the film industry into two camps. As a result, many film companies resigned from the FFC and formed their own organization, Suomen Filmiliitto (Finland's Film Union), while cinema owners supported American films and remained in the FFC. Several film companies, especially Suomi-Filmi, can be characterized as German oriented, but there were also practical reasons to submit to the IFC's demands. Because of the world conflict, all producers in Finland depended on Germany's supply of film stock. The German policy against American films also took other forms. In autumn 1942 German pressure on Finnish film censorship increased and 50 American films were banned (Sedergren 1999: 204–17).

This process, known as *filmiriita/ 'the film skirmish'*, was never discussed in the daily press because of censorship regulations. When the Continuation War ended in September 1944, everything changed, and the German-oriented Suomen

Filmilitto quickly had to withdraw its ban on American films. The film skirmish was over in three years, but the wartime split of Finnish film culture left a strong mark for decades.

CONCLUSION

The influence of World War II on the Nordic national cinemas was as varied as the effect the war had on the nations involved. For all film-producing countries, the war meant a boost for domestic film-making; in the case of the Danish and Swedish film industries it also meant increased export to Norway, where a limited number of film titles from its Nordic neighbours were both welcome and popular following the ban on American and British movies.

In terms of domestic film distribution and cinema exhibition, occupied Denmark and Norway were under pressure from the German film industry and occupation authorities to increase distribution of German film to fill the void created by the absence of Hollywood films from theatres in these countries. In Sweden the situation was paradoxical, given that Sweden was represented in the German-controlled IFC and accommodated German interests in the early war years, while at the same time enjoying access to popular Hollywood movies. For Finland, in the period as an ally with Germany, membership in the IFC caused a rift within the film industry between those accepting the chamber's attempt at blocking American and British films from the Finnish market and those who still wanted to have access to films from the nations that between 1941 and 1944 were Finland's enemies.

As noted above, film production in the Nordic countries received a boost during the war and while the bulk of movies produced continued

to be dominated by the genres and styles popular before the war, events during these years did not fail to make a mark. In Sweden the war ushered in the new genre of the *beredskapsfilm*, reflecting a new dependence on and respect for the armed forces maintaining Sweden's neutrality. In Denmark, the dark psychological drama was introduced, in Finland there were several features reflecting on Finland's situation during the Continuation War, while in Norway the great ambitions of the Nazified Film Directorate to make movies 'of great cultural and ideological importance' was met with universal rejection.

Norway and Denmark emerged from the war as exonerated victims of German aggression; in Sweden wartime neutrality paid off, laying the foundations for post-war prosperity, while Finland had to face great material, military and political loss. These different fates had an enormous impact on how this period came to be portrayed in popular memory and culture for the next half century.

REFERENCES

- Evensmo, Sigurd (1967), *Det store tivoli*, Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Hanche, Øyvind (2001), 'Krig i kulisene – Filmpolitikk i Norge under den norske NS-administrasjonen', in Gunnar Iversen (ed.), *Krigsbilder*, Trondheim: Kube. Skriftserie fra Institutt for kunst og medievitenskap, pp. 45–85.
- Helseth, Tore (2004), 'Norwegian Newsreels under German occupation', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 24: 1, pp. 35–44
- Iversen, Gunnar (1998), 'Norway', in Tytti Soila, Astrid Söderbergh Widding and Gunnar Iversen (eds), *Nordic National Cinemas*, London: Routledge, pp. 102–42.

- Salmi, Hannu (1993), *Elokuva ja historia*, Helsinki: Finnish Film Archive.
- Sedergren, Jari (1999), *Filmi poikki ...: Poliittinen elokuvasensuuri Suomessa 1939–1947*, Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Soila, Tytti (1998), 'Finland', in Tytti Soila, Astrid Söderbergh Widding and Gunnar Iversen (eds), *Nordic National Cinemas*, London: Routledge, pp. 31–95.
- Sørenssen, Bjørn (2007), 'From will to reality – Norwegian film during the Nazi occupation 1940–45', in Vande Winkel, Roel and Welch, David (eds), *Cinema and the Swastika: The International Expansion of Third Reich Cinema*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 220–31.
- Uusitalo, Kari (1977), *Ruutia, riitoja, rakkautta ... Suomalaisen elokuvan sotavuodet 1940–1948*, Helsinki: Finnish Film Foundation.
- (1943), *Det brinner en eld*, Sweden.
- Norta, Yrjö (1940), *SF-Paraati*, Finland
- (1944), *Hiipivä vaara*, Finland.
- Nortimo, Jorma (1944), *Herra ja ylhäisyys*, Finland.
- Orko, Risto (1941), *Ryhmy ja Romppainen*, Finland.
- (1943), *Jees ja just*, Finland.
- Sandø, Toralf (1941), *Den forsvundne pølse-maker*, Norway.
- Sinding, Leif (1943), *Sangen til livet*, Norway.
- Sjöberg, Alf (1940), *Med livet som insats*, Sweden.
- (1950), *Fröken Julie*, Sweden
- Särkkä, Toivo (1940), *Runon kuningas ja muuttolintu*, Finland.
- (1941), *Kulkurin valssi*, Finland.
- (1941), *Suomisen perhe*, Finland.
- (1944), *Ballaaadi*, Finland.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Sørenssen, B., Salmi, H., Kau, E. V. and Olsson, J. (2012), 'World War II and Scandinavian cinema: An overview', *Journal of Scandinavian Cinema* 2: 3, pp. 201–212, doi: [10.1386/jsca.2.3.201_1](https://doi.org/10.1386/jsca.2.3.201_1)

FILM REFERENCES

- Chaplin, Charlie (1940), *The Great Dictator*, USA.
- Dreyer, Carl Th. (1943), *Vredens dag*, Denmark.
- (1945), *Två människor*, Sweden.
- Ekman, Hasse (1940), *Första divisionen*, Sweden.
- (1944), *Excellensen*, Sweden.
- Elstelä, Ossi (1943), *Katariina ja Munkkiniemen kreivi* Helsinki, Finland.
- Fyrst, Walter (1943), *Unge viljer*, Norway.
- Harlan, Veit (1942), *Die goldene Stadt*, Germany.
- Henrikson, Anders (1940), *Ett brott*, Sweden.
- Leminen, Hannu (1943), *Valkoiset ruusut*, Finland.
- Luts, Theodor and Uotila, Erkki (1943), *Varjoja Kannaksella*, Finland.
- Molander, Gustaf (1942), *Rid i natt*, Sweden.

CONTRIBUTOR DETAILS

Jan Olsson is a Professor of Cinema Studies and former Head of Department at Stockholm University. His latest monograph is *Los Angeles Before Hollywood: Journalism and American Film Culture, 1905–1915* (2008); his latest collection is *Media, Popular Culture, and the American Century*, co-edited with Kingsley Bolton (2010). Primary research interests include early cinema, television studies and the global reach of American media.

Contact: jan.olsson@mail.film.su.se

Hannu Salmi is Professor of Cultural History at the University of Turku and director of the International Institute for Popular Culture (IIPC). He is the

author of, for example, *Nineteenth-Century Europe: A Cultural History* (2008) and the editor of *Historical Comedy On Screen: Subverting History with Humour* (2011).

Contact: hansalmi@utu.fi

Bjørn Sørenssen is Professor of Film Studies at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim. He has published on film history, documentary film and digital media, most recently 'The Polish Black Series documentary and the British Free Cinema movement' in Aniko Imre (ed.) *A Companion to Eastern European Cinemas* (2012).

Contact: bjorn.sorensen@hf.ntnu.no

Edvin Vestergaard Kau is Associate Professor in Media Studies at the

Department of Aesthetics and Communication, University of Aarhus. He has written on film theory, history and analysis; visual style in cinema; multimedia; and literature. Books include *Filmen i Danmark* (with Niels Jørgen Dinnesen, 1983) on the Danish film industry from the advent of sound to the 1980s, and *Dreyers Filmkunst* (1989), English edition, *The Cinema of Dreyer*, forthcoming.

Contact: imvek@hum.au.dk

Bjørn Sørenssen, Hannu Salmi, Edvin Vestergaard Kau and Jan Olsson have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work in the format that was submitted to Intellect Ltd.